

# On the relation between Unruh and Sokolov–Ternov effects

Emil T.Akhmedov<sup>1</sup>

Moscow, B.Chermushkinskaya, 25, ITEP, Russia 117218

and

Douglas Singleton<sup>2</sup>

Physics Department, CSU Fresno, Fresno, CA 93740-8031

## Abstract

We show that the Sokolov–Ternov effect — the depolarization of particles in storage rings coming from synchrotron radiation due to spin flip transitions — is physically equivalent to the Unruh effect for circular acceleration if one uses a spin 1/2 particle as the Unruh–DeWitt detector. It is shown that for the electron, with gyromagnetic number  $g \approx 2$ , the exponential contribution to the polarization, which usually characterizes the Unruh effect, is “hidden” in the standard Sokolov–Ternov effect making it hard to observe. Thus, our conclusions are different in detail from previous work.

## 1 Introduction

One of the goals of this note is to show that the exotic effect of particle observation by a detector undergoing a non-inertial motion can be seen as an ordinary quantum field theory (QFT) phenomenon. This is done in detail for the Unruh effect for circular motion but by implication should extend to other situations, e.g. the Hawking radiation from a black hole. We do not derive any new formula, but rather present well known ones in a new light and establish relations between seemingly unrelated phenomena.

In the Unruh effect a classical detector moving with acceleration in the background of a QFT can excite its internal degrees of freedom even if the QFT at the beginning is in its ground state. The standard Unruh effect is the situation where a detector moves eternally with constant acceleration (in direction and magnitude) and excites its internal degrees of freedom [1]. In this work by the Unruh effect we mean a more general phenomenon: a detector in *any* non-inertial, homogeneous motion in *flat, empty Minkowski space* which excites its internal degrees of freedom. Note that the excitation which is of interest to us is not due to the fact that one part of the detector moves with respect to another one (like the pointer/arrow of an ammeter which moves with respect to its box if it is shaken), but rather is due to the existence of radiation

---

<sup>1</sup>akhmedov@itep.ru

<sup>2</sup>dougs@csufresno.edu

in the detector's non-inertial reference frame. If the detector undergoes *homogeneous* motion, then all its parts are in static equilibrium with respect to each other and shaking/excitation due to internal forces does not occur. Homogeneous motions happen under (combined) actions of two constant forces — constant in direction and magnitude (causing linear acceleration) and constant in magnitude (causing orbiting acceleration). The excitation of the detector due to its shaking it is not a universal phenomenon, but depends on its internal structure. It is for this reason that we consider homogeneous motion, since then every thing just depends on the features of the radiation detected by the detector in its non-inertial reference frame. As we will see the characteristic features of the radiation in question depend on the type of homogeneous motion performed by the detector. Whether the radiation is thermal or not is *not* important to us in this note. We confirm previous observations that the radiation in the orbiting reference frame is non-thermal which contradicts some statements of [1]. What is important for us in this note is simply the existence of the radiation, which shows that detectors in linear accelerating motion and in orbiting motion get excited for the same physical reason — due to the existence of the radiation detected by the detector in its non-inertial reference frame.

Qualitatively this effect is very similar to the Hawking radiation of black holes [3] (see the discussion in the concluding section). Normally these effects are too small to be detected experimentally, with the one possible exception being the radiation detected by a detector in uniform circular motion. Thus we examine to what extent it might be possible to detect the Unruh type characteristic exponential factor in the excitation probability rate for circular motion. It is shown that for electrons with gyromagnetic number  $g \approx 2$  that the characteristic exponential behavior of the excitation probability rate is “hidden” in the standard Sokolov–Ternov effect and is thus hard to observe. However, we show that particles with general  $g$  do experience substantial exponential factor contribution. Thus, another goal of this paper is to investigate the question of the experimental observability of the characteristic Unruh type exponential factor in the excitation probability rate.

In this paper in all cases we consider Minkowski spacetime, and we take  $\hbar = 1$  and  $c = 1$ . We study the reaction of detectors in motion with respect to vacuum fluctuations of a background scalar quantum fields. For simplicity we consider a two-level detector. The specific example we have in mind is a spin 1/2 particle in a magnetic field. Our considerations are easy to generalize to detectors with an arbitrary number of states and also background quantum fields other than scalar. The energy of the ground state of the detector,  $|0\rangle$ , is  $\mathcal{E}_d$ , while the energy of its excited state,  $|1\rangle$ , is  $\mathcal{E}_u$ . The characteristic monopole interaction Hamiltonian for such a detector in background scalar fields  $\phi_a$ ,  $a = 1, \dots, N$  is

$$\hat{H}_{int}(t) = q \sqrt{\dot{x}_\mu^2(t)} \hat{\mu}_a[x(t)] \hat{\phi}_a[x(t)] = q \sqrt{\dot{x}_\mu^2(t)} e^{-i \hat{P}_\mu^{(D)} x^\mu(t)} \hat{\mu}_a(0) e^{i \hat{P}_\mu^{(D)} x^\mu(t)} \hat{\phi}_a[x(t)], \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{\mu}_a$  is the detector's monopole moment, which describes its interaction with the external scalar fields  $\phi_a$ ;  $\hat{P}_\mu^{(D)} = (\hat{H}_D, \vec{\hat{P}}_D)$  is the detectors four-momentum governing the dynamics of the free detector (in the detector's rest frame  $\hat{H}_D|0\rangle = \mathcal{E}_d|0\rangle$  and  $\hat{H}_D|1\rangle = \mathcal{E}_u|1\rangle$ );  $x(t)$  is the detector's trajectory;  $q$  is the coupling constant;  $\dot{x}_\mu^2(t) = g_{\mu\nu}(x) (dx^\mu/dt) (dx^\nu/dt)$ , where  $g_{\mu\nu}$  is the metric of the space-time. It is easy to see that the Hamiltonian in question is invariant under general covariance and re-parameterization invariance (change of  $t$ ). Below we consider situations where  $\sqrt{\dot{x}_\mu^2(t)}$  is equal either 1 or  $\gamma^{-1}$  depending on whether we consider  $t$  as proper or laboratory time;  $\gamma$  is the relativistic  $\gamma$ -factor. Furthermore, if we consider the detector's rest

frame then  $\hat{P}_\mu^{(D)} x^\mu(t) = \hat{H}_D t$ , where  $t$  is the proper time. In all analysis below we will indicate whether we are using proper or laboratory time.

To understand the origin of this Hamiltonian recall the one describing the standard non-relativistic interaction of the spin  $\vec{s}$  with the magnetic field  $\vec{H}$ :  $\hat{H}_{int} \propto \vec{s}[t] \cdot \vec{H}[x(t)]$ . In eq.(1) we just consider the simplified version of such an interaction between the relativistically moving detector, (this is the reason for the factor  $\sqrt{x_\mu^2}$ ) and scalar fields  $\phi_a$  instead of a vector field  $\vec{H}$  (this is the reason for the factor  $\hat{\mu}_a$  instead of spin  $\vec{s}$ ).

In the main case of interest to us both the detector and the background QFT are originally in their ground states and the detector moves along a specified trajectory  $x(t)$ . We want to find the probability for the detector to get excited at the cost of work performed by the force pulling the detector along the trajectory. As the result of such a process the background QFT will become excited as well.

To leading order in  $q$  the amplitude for such a process is:

$$\mathbb{A} = i \int dt \left\langle 1 \left| \otimes \left\langle \psi \left| \hat{H}_{int}(t) \right| \text{Vac} \right\rangle \otimes \left| 0 \right\rangle \right\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where  $|\psi\rangle$  is the final state of the QFT. Hence, to leading order in perturbation theory the probability in question in the co-moving reference frame is:

$$P \propto q^2 \left\langle 0 \left| \mu_a(0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \left\langle 1 \left| \mu_b(0) \right| 0 \right\rangle \int \int dt dt' e^{-i\Delta\mathcal{E}(t-t')} \left\langle 0 \left| \phi_a[x(t)] \right| \psi \right\rangle \left\langle \psi \left| \phi_b[x(t')] \right| 0 \right\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_u - \mathcal{E}_d$ . A non-vanishing contribution for this expression appears when  $|\psi\rangle$  contains one quantum of at least one of the fields  $\phi_a$ .

We would like to consider the total probability rate per unit time. To obtain it we have to sum eq.(3) over all final states  $\psi$  of the QFT using the decomposition:

$$\sum_{\psi} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi| = 1. \quad (4)$$

Because the integral over  $t$  in eq.(3) has not yet been taken, energy conservation is not imposed. Hence, in eq.(4) we are summing over *all* states of the QFT rather than over those at a given energy. Now we change the integration variables in eq.(3) to  $\tau = t - t'$  and  $\tau' = t + t'$  and dropping the integral over  $\tau'$  we obtain the probability decay rate in question:

$$w(t) \propto q^2 \left\langle 0 \left| \mu_a(0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \left\langle 1 \left| \mu_b(0) \right| 0 \right\rangle \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau e^{-i\Delta\mathcal{E}\tau} G_{ab} \left[ x(t - \tau/2), x(t + \tau/2) \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $G_{ab} [x(t - \tau/2), x(t + \tau/2)] = \left\langle \phi_a[x(t - \tau/2)] \phi_b[x(t + \tau/2)] \right\rangle$  is the Wightman function of the QFT. This derivation of eq.(5) from eq.(3) is correct only for homogeneous motions (for a more detailed study see [2]).

In more general situations the state of the background QFT is characterized by the density matrix  $\hat{\rho}$ . For the thermal state

$$\rho_{MK} = \delta_{MK} \frac{e^{-\frac{\mathcal{E}_M}{T}}}{Z_{tot}}, \quad \text{and} \quad Z_{tot} = \sum_M e^{-\frac{\mathcal{E}_M}{T}}, \quad (6)$$

where  $M$  and  $K$  are multi-indices labeling the energy levels of the QFT. In the zero temperature limit,  $T \rightarrow 0$ , only the vacuum state survives and we go back to the situation described in the previous paragraph.

Additionally we want to find the probability rate for the detector to change from the ground state to the excited one and vice versa. A derivation similar to the one above with finite temperature leads to the following golden rule formula for this probability rate:

$$w_{\mp}(t) \propto q^2 \left\langle 0 \left| \mu_a(0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \left\langle 1 \left| \mu_b(0) \right| 0 \right\rangle \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau e^{\mp i \Delta \mathcal{E} \tau} G_{ab}^{(T)} \left[ x(t - \tau/2) , x(t + \tau/2) \right], \quad (7)$$

where now  $G_{ab}^{(T)} \left[ x(t - \tau/2) , x(t + \tau/2) \right] = \text{Tr} \left\{ \hat{\rho} \phi_a[x(t - \tau/2)] \phi_b[x(t + \tau/2)] \right\}$  is the thermal Wightman function and the trace is taken over all states of the QFT. In this equation the “−” sign corresponds to the rate for the detector to get excited from its ground state, while the “+” sign corresponds to the rate of the excited detector to decay to the ground state.

There are several well understood situations in which eq.(7) gives non-zero transition rates. We will study most of these in detail in the main body of the text. The first example we will examine is a static detector in the heat bath. In this case eq.(7) yields the standard Planckian behavior for  $w_{\pm}$ , i.e. the detector sees particles with a Planckian spectrum. Furthermore, if one considers eq.(7) at  $T = 0$  one finds  $w_- = 0$ , but  $w_+ \neq 0$  since there is zero probability for the detector to get excited in this case, but if the static detector is originally in its excited state there is a non-zero probability for it to *spontaneously* decay to the ground state.

A more exotic situation is the Unruh effect [1]. To describe this effect in the standard way one considers the detector moving eternally with constant (in direction and magnitude) acceleration. Additionally one takes the internal degrees of freedom of the detector as decoupled from the external ones as can be seen from the derivation of eq.(5). Let us explain this point. In the standard description of the Unruh effect there are three forces which in general are of a different nature. The first force pulls the detector along its trajectory. The second force is associated with the energy splitting between  $\mathcal{E}_d$  and  $\mathcal{E}_u$ . The third force corresponds to the fields which are radiated when the detector changes its internal state. This situation is very hard to realize experimentally. For a charged particle in an accelerator storage ring all of these three forces are electromagnetic in nature. It is this fact which allows one to see the Sokolov–Ternov effect as the Unruh effect but “spoiled” by several impurities.

In section 3 we show at  $T = 0$  and with  $x(t)$  describing hyperbolic motion (i.e. constant acceleration and  $t$  being the proper time of the detector), that eq.(7) yields a detector which sees particles of the background QFT with a standard Planckian spectrum whose temperature is proportional to its acceleration. Thus, even if the background QFT is originally in its vacuum state the detector can get excited just because it takes a non-trivial, non-inertial motion in flat space-time. This is equivalent to the detector being at rest, but embedded in a heat bath with appropriate temperature.

However, the case of eternal, constant, linear acceleration suffers from various subtleties due to the presence of a horizon in the detectors reference frame. This complicates the study of the Unruh effect due to the necessity to input boundary conditions in the detectors proper non-inertial reference frame [5]. This leads one to questionable conclusions about existence of the Unruh effect [6] and even of Hawking radiation [7]. We will come back to the discussion of these concerns below in section 3. As an aside if the Unruh effect manifested itself *only* for eternal (homogeneous) linear accelerating motion then the effect would not be physical

since it is not possible to arrange for a particle or reference frame to have such a trajectory. For this reason we are interested in more realistic and experimentally obtainable motions. Of particular interest is the detector moving along a trajectory which eventually brings it back to the same point in space. In addition we want the motion to be homogeneous in time or nearly so since this simplifies the calculations in eq.(5) and eq.(7). Purely homogeneous motions are not experimentally realizable, but there are cases when a real motion is well approximated by a homogeneous one.

For these reasons homogeneous, circular motion is the best choice for our study. In particular, there is no horizon (only a light surface or light radius) for an observer in circular motion. Additionally homogeneous circular motion gives a good approximation for the trajectory of particles in accelerator storage rings. However, for circular motion the observed radiation does not have a thermal spectrum. The detector will still get excited, but the spectrum of the detected particles is not Planckian.

At the end of the day we would like to study a situation which can in principle be realized experimentally. To this end we take an electrically charged particle with spin as our detector of the Unruh effect. This brings us to Sokolov–Ternov effect [8] (see [9], [10] and [11] for reviews). The Sokolov–Ternov effect describes the partial depolarization of electrons in a magnetic field in storage rings due to synchrotron radiation. The relation between the Unruh and the Sokolov–Ternov effects has been previously discussed by Bell and Leinaas [12], and it was proposed that one might be able to observe the circular Unruh effect through this depolarization effect on electrons. Our conclusions are different in detail from those in [12], where the authors observe the Unruh effect within Sokolov–Ternov one in different circumstances — with a non-constant background magnetic field. (See also reference [13] [14] for other difficulties/subtleties associated with observing the circular Unruh effect). In particular we find that because the electron has  $g \approx 2$  that the characteristic exponential factor of the circular Unruh effect is obscured when the background is that of a constant magnetic field. To observe this exponential factor one should use some particle with  $g$  significantly different than 2. The qualitative explanation of Sokolov-Ternov effect goes as follows: <sup>3</sup>

It is well known that electrons in circular motion radiate. In the quasi-classical approximation the total power radiated (due to the electron’s electric charge) is:

$$I_o = \frac{2 e^2}{3 R} \gamma^4 \omega_0, \quad (8)$$

where  $e$  is the charge of the electron;  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - v^2}$ ;  $\omega_0 = 1/R$  is the angular velocity of the electron in the ultra-relativistic limit ( $v \approx 1$ );  $R = \mathcal{E}/e H$  is the radius of the electron’s orbit;  $\mathcal{E} = m \gamma$  is the energy of the electron;  $H$  is the background, constant magnetic field. The quasi-classical approximation is valid when the electron is ultra-relativistic and we can neglect both quantization of its motion and back-reaction to the photon radiation.

Electrons have two energy levels in an external constant magnetic field: with their spins along and against the direction of the magnetic field. Hence, electrons can also radiate via flips of their spins. The ratio of the power radiated due to the motion of the electron and due to its

---

<sup>3</sup>A more detailed explanation is given in sections 3 and 4 below. The development in this section is a summary of [9].

spin flip radiations is [9]:

$$\frac{I_{sf}}{I_o} = 3 \left( \frac{\gamma^2}{m R} \right)^2 \left( 1 \pm \frac{35 \sqrt{3}}{64} \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $I_{sf}$  is the power of the spin flip radiation, and the “ $\pm$ ” signs on the RHS correspond to the spin flips with a decrease/increase of the spin energy, respectively. One can define a critical  $\gamma$ -factor as  $\gamma_c = \sqrt{m R}$ . For characteristic values one finds  $\gamma_c \approx 10^7$ , while  $\gamma \approx 10^5$ . Hence, the value (9) is of the order of  $10^{-8}$ . Thus, only a very small fraction of the radiation energy is due to the spin flip. Because of this, the electron beam, which starts non-polarized, should *slowly* become polarized according to the law:

$$\mathbb{P}(t) = \mathbb{P}_0 (1 - e^{-t/\tau_0}) = \frac{8}{5 \sqrt{3}} (1 - e^{-t/\tau_0}) \approx 0.92 (1 - e^{-t/\tau_0}). \quad (10)$$

The value of equilibrium polarization in the constant external magnetic field,  $\mathbb{P}_0$ , will be discussed in section 4 (see eq.(69)). The characteristic time is:

$$\tau_0 = \frac{8}{5 \sqrt{3}} \frac{m^2 R^3}{e^2 \gamma^5}. \quad (11)$$

With the characteristic values of  $R \sim 1$  km and  $\gamma \sim 10^5$  the time  $\tau_0$  is on the order of one hour. At first sight it seems that the electron beam should become completely polarized due to the spin flip radiation. However, the spin flip can happen in both “directions” — either decreasing or increasing the spin energy. Due to the presence of the latter effect the polarization is not complete. Of course the total energy of the system – electron plus radiation – is not conserved due to the presence of the external electromagnetic field which drives the electron along its trajectory.

This sounds very similar to the Unruh effect where the thermal bath (appearing in the electron’s reference system) tends to depolarize the electrons. However, in this form of the Sokolov–Ternov effect it is hard to see its relation to the Unruh effect, because usually the latter contains a characteristic exponential contribution to the polarization,  $\mathbb{P}_0$ , while eq.(10) does not seem to share this property (in eq.(10)  $\mathbb{P}_0$  simply equals a constant). The exponential contribution dominates only when the orbital motion is decoupled from the internal degrees of freedom, as pointed out in the discussion two paragraphs after eq.(7). To see the origin of the exponential part of the effect, one has to consider particles with arbitrarily gyromagnetic number  $g$ ; eq.(9)—eq.(11) are valid for electrons with  $g = 2$ . To understand what is going on, let us consider the effect in the inertial reference frame instantaneously co-moving with the detector. In this frame the background constant magnetic field is  $H' = \gamma H$  (we always consider electrons moving perpendicular to the magnetic field). The spin degree of freedom can approximately be treated non-relativistically in this frame. The magnetic moment

$$\vec{\mu} = \frac{g}{2} \frac{e}{2m} \vec{\sigma}, \quad (12)$$

of this spin system has two energy levels with an energy difference

$$\Delta \mathcal{E} = \left| \frac{g}{2} \right| \frac{e H'}{m} = \left| \frac{g}{2} \right| \gamma^2 \omega_0. \quad (13)$$

It seems that in this case *the only non-zero* probability rate is for the spontaneous magnetic dipole transition *from the upper state to the lower one*. The rate is

$$w_+ = \frac{4}{3} (\Delta\mathcal{E})^3 |\langle 1 | \vec{\mu} | 0 \rangle|^2 = \frac{2}{3} \left| \frac{g}{2} \right|^5 \frac{e^2}{m^2} \gamma^6 \omega_0^3. \quad (14)$$

Time dilation gives a laboratory transition rate reduced by one power of  $\gamma$ . With  $\omega_0 = 1/R$  and  $g = 2$  in the case of ultra-relativistic electron, eq.(14) then leads to the characteristic time:

$$\tau_\infty = \frac{3}{2} \frac{m^2 R^3}{e^2 \gamma^5}. \quad (15)$$

This can be compared to eq.(11). Thus, naive arguments give approximately the correct characteristic time and tell us that eventually all electrons (i.e. detectors) become polarized, i.e.  $\mathbb{P}_0 = 1$ .

What is wrong with these naive arguments? Why do they not give the correct answer? This answer is in fact correct for particles with large  $g$ , i.e.  $g \rightarrow \infty$  or neutral particles. For the latter situation we should eliminate  $g$ ,  $e$  and  $R$  in all formulae in favor of the magnetic field  $H$  and magnetic moment  $\mu$  by means of  $g e = 4 \mu m$  and  $e R = \gamma m/H$ . A clue to this observation can be found from the fact that a neutral particle with a given magnetic moment can be considered as the limit of a particle with infinitesimally small charge and a large (infinite)  $g$  factor:  $g = 4 \mu m/e$ .

The reason for the relative reliability of the simple arguments for large  $g$  and their unreliability for small  $g$  can be understood by considering the general features of the spin motion and the mechanical motion of a charged particle. It is well known [10] that the magnetic moment of a particle precesses in a uniform magnetic field with a frequency (in the laboratory frame):

$$\omega_s = \left[ 1 + \gamma \left( \frac{g-2}{2} \right) \right] \omega_0. \quad (16)$$

For a  $g$  factor appreciably different from 2,  $\omega_s$  becomes very large compared to  $\omega_0$  for extreme relativistic motion. The relevant quantity is the number of precessions during the short time  $\Delta t \approx 1/\gamma \omega_0$  it takes the particle to trace out a segment of path that subtends an angle  $\Delta\theta \approx 1/\gamma$  at the center of the orbit. It is this time interval that is germane to the emission of relativistic synchrotron radiation in any given direction (see the discussion at the beginning of section 4). For  $\gamma \gg 1$  the number of precessions in  $\Delta t$  is  $\approx (g-2)/4\pi$ .

For large  $g$  the magnetic moment precesses many complete revolutions during the characteristic time interval  $\Delta t$ . This rapidly spinning system has ample time to establish the two-level system described above and to undergo the simple magnetic dipole transition, without being influenced appreciably by the orbital motion. Said another way, the instantaneously co-moving inertial frame closely approximates the detector's rest frame for long enough, that the simple non-relativistic arguments can be applied.

For a  $g$  factor of order unity, however, the magnetic moment does not precess rapidly enough to ignore the coupling between the spin system and the orbital motion. A proper calculation (presented in section 4) shows that eq.(14) receives an exponential correction (for both  $w_+$  and  $w_-$ ) in the large  $g$  limit. The correction is proportional to  $e^{-\sqrt{3}(g-2)}/g$ . It is this correction to  $w_-$  (making it non-vanishing) which is usually taken to be the circular Unruh effect. The exponential factor is equal to 1 if  $g = 2$  and that is the reason why the Unruh exponential contribution is usually overlooked in the standard Sokolov-Ternov calculations.

The organization of the paper is as follows: Sections 2 and 3 review well known facts about finite temperature QFT and the reaction of detectors traveling on some given trajectory. They do not contain any new observations, but give the needed background for the following calculations and discussion. The reader familiar with all the standard facts of finite temperature Wightman (Green) functions, reaction of detectors to a heat bath and the standard derivation of the Unruh effect can immediately proceed to section 4, where we discuss more realistic and more experimentally realizable situations. Section 5 gives a summary and discussion of the results.

## 2 Detector in a heat bath

In this section we consider the static detector in the heat bath – background QFT at finite temperature. The probability for the detector to become excited or to radiate is given by eq.(7). To perform the integration in this formula we take, as our example, the two-point correlation function for the field theory of one massless real scalar field:

$$G_T(x, x') = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} \left[ \frac{e^{-\frac{H}{T}}}{Z_{tot}} \left\{ \phi(x), \phi(x') \right\} \right], \quad (17)$$

where  $x$  and  $x'$  are four-coordinates:  $x = (t, \vec{r})$ ;  $\{, \}$  is the symmetrized product of the fields. We take the symmetrized product of the fields in the definition of the two-point function because in this form its connection to the Unruh effect is more apparent. For the standard, thermal Green functions given by Keldish [15] the answers are qualitatively similar in the following sense: the equilibrium polarization for both the Unruh effect and the heat bath are the same but the way in which the system reaches equilibrium is different [16].

We Fourier expand the field as follows:

$$\phi(t, \vec{r}) = \int \frac{d^3p}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\omega}} \left\{ a(\vec{p}) \exp[-i(\omega t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r})] + \text{c.c.} \right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|} \quad (18)$$

and plug this expression into:

$$G_T(x, x') = \dots \sum_{n_{p_1}=0}^{\infty} \sum_{n_{p_2}=0}^{\infty} \dots \frac{e^{-\frac{\mathcal{E}_n(p_1)}{T}}}{Z_1} \frac{e^{-\frac{\mathcal{E}_n(p_2)}{T}}}{Z_2} \dots \times \left\langle \dots n_{p_1}, n_{p_2} \dots \left| \left\{ \phi(x), \phi(x') \right\} \right| \dots n_{p_1}, n_{p_2} \dots \right\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where  $\mathcal{E}_n(p) = \omega(p) (n + 1/2)$  and the state  $\langle \dots n_{p_1}, n_{p_2} \dots |$  contains  $n_{p_1}$  quanta of wave vector  $\vec{p}_1$ ,  $n_{p_2}$  quanta of wave vector  $\vec{p}_2$ , etc. We now obtain:

$$G_T(x, x') = \int \frac{d^3p}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{\omega} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\exp\left[-\frac{\omega(n+\frac{1}{2})}{T}\right]}{Z} \left\{ \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \exp[-i p(x - x')] + \text{c.c.} \right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}. \quad (20)$$

Here the symmetrized product of  $a$  and  $a^+$  has been used and

$$Z = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp\left[-\frac{\omega(n+\frac{1}{2})}{T}\right]. \quad (21)$$

Using the relation

$$\coth\left(\frac{\omega}{2T}\right) = 2 \frac{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) \exp\left[-\frac{\omega\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)}{T}\right]}{\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \exp\left[-\frac{\omega\left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)}{T}\right]} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{e^{\frac{\omega}{T}} - 1}, \quad (22)$$

we can represent the two-point function as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} G_T(x, x') &= \int \frac{d^3p}{4\pi^2} \coth\left(\frac{\omega}{2T}\right) \frac{\cos\{p(x - x')\}}{\omega} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|} \\ &= \int \frac{d^4p}{(2\pi)^4} \coth\left(\frac{\omega}{2T}\right) \frac{\exp\{-i p(x - x')\}}{p^2 - i\epsilon} \\ &= T \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i 2\pi n T(t-t')} \int \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\exp\{-i \vec{p}(\vec{r} - \vec{r}')\}}{(2\pi n T)^2 - \vec{p}^2 - i\epsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $N(\omega) \equiv \coth(\omega/2T) = 1/2 + 1/(e^{\frac{\omega}{T}} - 1)$  is the number of states at the energy level  $\omega$ . The  $1/2$  term in the sum comes from the zero modes, while the other contribution is the standard Planckian spectrum. In eq.(23) the last expression is obtained after integration over  $\omega$  in the complex plane around the poles of the coth function. To perform the integration we use the fact that near its poles the coth function behaves as:

$$\coth\left(\frac{z}{2T}\right) \approx \frac{2T}{z - 2\pi i n T}, \quad n \in Z. \quad (24)$$

The last expression in eq.(23) contains the well known sum over the Matsubara frequencies. However, we have written it in the Minkowski signature, because we are considering *dynamical* fields at finite temperature. The justification of the use of the Matsubara approach to describe the dynamics near thermal equilibrium can be found in [15]. We have presented the derivation of the two-point correlation function and written out all the components in the final expression of eq.(23) to show the phenomenon which we are studying from various different perspectives.

Evaluating the integrals in eq.(23) gives:

$$G_T(x, x') \propto \frac{T}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|} \left\{ \coth\left[\pi T \left((t - t') + |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|\right)\right] - \coth\left[\pi T \left((t - t') - |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|\right)\right] \right\}. \quad (25)$$

It is easy to see from this expression that when  $T \rightarrow 0$  we obtain  $G_0(x, x') \propto 1/(|t - t'|^2 - |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'|^2)$ , while for finite  $T$  if we take the limit  $\Delta r = |\vec{r} - \vec{r}'| \rightarrow 0$  then  $G_T(t, t') \propto T \frac{d \coth[\pi T(t-t')]}{dt} \propto T^2 / \sinh^2[\pi T(t - t')]$ .

To obtain the probability rate in question we have to substitute some particular trajectory  $\vec{r}(t)$  into this thermal Wightman function and then substitute the resulting expression into eq.(7). For a static detector  $x = (t, 0, 0, 0)$  we obtain ( $\tau = t - t'$  and  $\Delta\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_u - \mathcal{E}_d$ ):

$$w_{\mp}(t) \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \left\langle 0 \left| \mu(0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau e^{\mp i \Delta\mathcal{E} \tau} \frac{T^2}{\sinh^2[\pi T(\tau - i\epsilon)]}, \quad (26)$$

where we have taken the standard regularization of the  $\tau = 0$  singularity of the propagator. The integrand in eq.(26) has poles along imaginary  $\tau$  axis corresponding to zeros of the sinh

function. They are at  $\tau = n i/T + i\epsilon$ ,  $n \in Z$ . We are in general interested only in the first, non-trivial pole ( $n = \mp 1$ ), for it is this pole which gives the characteristic Boltzmann exponential factor in  $w_{\mp}$ . However, the integral in eq.(26) can be evaluated exactly (unlike more general cases) by using the following contour (see e.g. [12]): Go along the real axis from  $\tau = -\infty$  to  $\tau = +\infty$ ; at  $\tau = \pm\infty$  take short vertical lines up to  $\text{Im}\tau = 2\pi/T$ ; take the return path along the line  $\text{Im}\tau = 2\pi/T$ . This is a rectangular contour of infinite length and height  $2\pi/T$ . Using the result for the integral with such a contour we find  $w_{\mp}$  and that the equilibrium “polarization” (the ratio of the number of states in the upper level to those in the lower levels) in the heat bath is:

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \frac{w_+ - w_-}{w_+ + w_-} = -\frac{1 - \exp\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{T}\right)}{1 + \exp\left(\frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{T}\right)} \rightarrow 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{T}\right), \quad \text{if } \Delta\mathcal{E} \gg T. \quad (27)$$

We have not discussed the characteristic time for reaching the equilibrium. This is contained in the pre-exponential part of  $w_{\pm}$  and properly should be calculated using Keldish approach [15].

The polarization in eq.(27) is not unity since the background QFT is not in a vacuum state and, hence, has excitations which can be absorbed by the detector. Thus, a static detector in a heat bath can become excited by absorbing energy from the heat bath.

### 3 Unruh effect

In this section we apply eq.(7), with the background QFT initially in its ground state, (i.e.  $T = 0$ ), but with the detector moving along some given trajectory. We want to determine if the detector has a non-zero excitation rate,  $w_-$ , as it moves along the trajectory in the background QFT, which we take to be (for simplicity) one massless, real scalar field. A more realistic situation will be studied in section 4.

Under these conditions eq.(7) takes the form:

$$w_{\mp}(t) \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \left\langle 0 \left| \mu \ (0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \times \frac{e^{\mp i \Delta\mathcal{E} \tau}}{|x_0(t + \tau/2) - x_0(t - \tau/2) - i\epsilon|^2 - |\vec{x}(t + \tau/2) - \vec{x}(t - \tau/2)|^2}, \quad (28)$$

where  $\tau = t - t'$  is the detector’s proper time and  $\Delta\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_u - \mathcal{E}_d$ . We have explicitly substituted into eq.(7) the Wightman function of a four-dimensional free massless scalar field at  $T = 0$ . To obtain the rate in question we have to substitute into eq.(28) whichever trajectory,  $x(t)$ , we are interested in. In general  $w_{\mp}$  explicitly depends on time  $t$ . However, for homogeneous motions this dependence disappears, greatly simplifying the calculation of the integral in eq.(28).

#### 3.1 Motion with constant velocity

In the case of motion with constant velocity  $v$  the trajectory is  $x(t) = (\gamma t, \gamma v t, 0, 0)$ , with  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - v^2}$  and  $t$  is the detector’s proper time. Inserting this trajectory into eq.(28), we obtain:

$$w_{\mp}(t) = w_{\mp} \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \left\langle 0 \left| \mu \ (0) \right| 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \frac{e^{\mp i \Delta\mathcal{E} \tau}}{(\gamma \tau - i\epsilon)^2 - (\gamma v \tau)^2}. \quad (29)$$

In this case  $w_{\mp}$  does not depend on  $t$ . This happens because the motion is homogenous. If instead of considering the phenomenon from the point of view of the co-moving reference frame we had considered the laboratory reference frame,  $w_{\mp}$  would be changed by a factor of  $\gamma$  because of time dilation (see the factor of  $\sqrt{\dot{x}_{\mu}^2}$  in eq.(1)). In eq.(29) we are using the standard regularization of the Wightman function which shifts the pole at  $\tau = 0$  to the upper complex half-plane. As we will see in a moment such a regularization is necessary to have a non-zero probability for the spontaneous radiation of the detector if it is originally in the excited state.

The integral in eq.(29) is taken using contour integration in the complex  $\tau$  plane. Since  $\mathcal{E}_u > \mathcal{E}_d$ , the integral in eq.(29), for  $w_-$  uses a contour which is closed with a large semi-circle in the lower complex half-plane. This contour is denoted by  $C_-$ . For  $w_+$  the contour is closed with a large semi-circle in the upper complex half-plane, and is denoted by  $C_+$ . It is this choice of the contours which we will use for  $w_{\mp}$  everywhere below.

The expression in the denominator of the integrand in eq.(29) has two zeros at

$$\tau_{\pm} = i\epsilon \sqrt{\frac{1 \pm v}{1 \mp v}}. \quad (30)$$

Hence

$$w_{\mp} \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \oint_{C_{\mp}} d\tau \frac{e^{\mp i \Delta \mathcal{E} \tau}}{\tau_+ - \tau_-} \left( \frac{1}{\tau - \tau_+} - \frac{1}{\tau - \tau_-} \right). \quad (31)$$

Evaluating the integrals gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_- &= 0, \\ w_+ &\propto q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \Delta \mathcal{E}, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

because  $C_-$  does not enclose any poles, while  $C_+$  does. This result is independent of the velocity and, hence, is valid for the static detector. The physical meaning of the above result is as follows: If the detector moves with constant velocity in the vacuum of a QFT there is zero probability for it to get excited,  $w_- = 0$ . However, if the detector was originally in the excited state, there is a non-zero probability for it to radiate spontaneously,  $w_+ \neq 0$ .

### 3.2 Motion with constant linear acceleration

We proceed to the case of constant (in direction and magnitude) acceleration  $a$ . This time  $x(t) = (\frac{1}{a} \sinh[at], \frac{1}{a} \cosh[at], 0, 0)$ , where  $t$  is the detector's proper time. Substitution of this expression into eq.(28) gives:

$$w_{\mp} \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \oint_{C_{\mp}} d\tau e^{\mp i \Delta \mathcal{E} \tau} \frac{a^2}{\sinh^2 \left[ \frac{a}{2} (\tau - i\epsilon) \right]}. \quad (33)$$

Again the rate  $w_{\mp}$  does not depend on the time because the motion is homogenous. In eq.(33) the standard regularization of the Wightman function is used (see [2] for a discussion of this point).

The expression in eq.(33) is essentially the same as the heat bath formula eq.(26). Therefore a detector moving with constant acceleration in the background QFT (which is originally in the

vacuum state) gets excited. In addition the detector sees particles with the standard Planckian distribution. The temperature of the accelerating case can be read off by comparing eq.(33) and eq.(26) and is [1]:

$$T = \frac{a}{2\pi}. \quad (34)$$

In the previous section it was shown that the static detector in a heat bath gets excited due to the absorption of thermal excitations from the background QFT. This raises the question as to why the accelerating detector becomes excited if it is in a vacuum state of the QFT? The general physical explanation is that both the detector and QFT are excited at the cost of work performed by the force driving the detector along its trajectory. In greater detail this can be explained as follows: The Hamiltonian of the background QFT in the detector's co-moving, non-inertial reference frame has negative energy eigenstates [17]. The detector can radiate these negative energy eigenstates which then excites the detector. The energy for this comes from the external driving force, i.e. the system is not closed. We can explain the negative energy eigenstates by looking at the Wightman function which was used in the derivation of eq.(33) or eq.(29) under different types of motion:

$$G[x(\tau), x(0)] \propto \frac{1}{|x(\tau) - x(0)|^2} \propto \int \frac{d^3p}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{\omega} \exp\{-i p[x(\tau) - x(0)]\}|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}. \quad (35)$$

First consider constant velocity motion where  $x(t) = (\gamma t, \gamma \vec{v} t)$ . Plugging this representation of the Wightman function with this trajectory  $x(t)$  into eq.(28), we obtain:

$$w_{\mp} \propto q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int \frac{d^3p}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{\omega} \exp\left\{-i \left[ \pm \Delta \mathcal{E} + \gamma(\omega - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}) \right] \tau\right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}. \quad (36)$$

Taking the integral over  $\tau$  first, gives an energy conserving  $\delta$ -function as the integrand of the  $d^3p$  integration

$$\delta\left[\pm \Delta \mathcal{E} + \gamma(\omega - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v})\right]. \quad (37)$$

This function vanishes for the upper (+) sign in its argument. For the + sign the argument is always greater than zero, because  $\mathcal{E}_u > \mathcal{E}_d$  and  $|\vec{p}| = \omega > \vec{p} \cdot \vec{v}$ , because  $v < 1$  [4]. Hence, in the case of constant velocity motion  $w_- = 0$ , but  $w_+ \neq 0$ , which follows just from energy conservation.

If the detector moves in an environment where its velocity is greater than the speed of light, it can produce Cherenkov type radiation. In this case it is possible to see that now the  $\delta$ -function in eq.(37) can be non-zero even for the case when the sign in front of  $\Delta \mathcal{E}$  is the “+” sign, i.e. the argument in eq.(37) can equal zero for some angles between  $\vec{p}$  and  $\vec{v}$ . This demonstrates the anomalous Doppler effect [18], which describes the well understood phenomenon that in such circumstances the detector can both radiate and have its internal degrees of freedom excited. A similar thing happens in the case of accelerated motion.

In the linear acceleration case we find

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mp} &\propto q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int \frac{d^3p}{4\pi^2} \frac{1}{\omega} \\ &\times \exp\left\{-i \left( \pm \Delta \mathcal{E} \tau + \frac{\omega}{a} \sinh(a\tau) - \frac{\vec{a} \cdot \vec{p}}{a^2} [\cosh(a\tau) - 1] \right)\right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

After the integration over  $\tau$  one will *not* obtain zero regardless of the sign chosen for  $\Delta\mathcal{E}$ . Thus, in this case energy conservation allows the detector to absorb positive energy states or, equivalently radiate negative energy states. To see this explicitly one has to take the integral over  $\tau$  in the saddle point approximation (if  $\Delta\mathcal{E}/a \gg 1$ ) and include contributions of all saddle points of  $\tau$ , which are related to the pole contributions in eq.(33). A clearer physical picture for the appearance of the radiation in the non-inertial reference frame can be obtained in the quasi-classical quantization scheme for relativistic particles in curved stationary backgrounds [19]. In the latter case it is straightforward to see that the radiation appears due to polarization of the vacuum in strong gravitational background fields (see [20] for a more detailed discussion on this issue).

All well and good, but as mentioned in the introduction the case of constant homogeneous linear acceleration is not possible to arrange in reality – one can not have an eternally accelerating detector. If one does consider a more realistic motion (e.g. a stationary detector which accelerates for a finite time and then moves with constant velocity) the initial and final conditions increase the difficulty of the analysis making it much harder (impossible) to get a clear physical picture of what is going on. In particular it is not clear whether or not there will be a non-trivial saddle point contribution as in eq.(38) if the acceleration is over a finite time.

Moreover, we have considered the phenomenon in question from the point of view of non-inertial, co-moving reference system. If instead we study the phenomenon from the point of view of the laboratory, inertial reference frame then the trajectory is  $x(t) = (t, \sqrt{1/a^2 + t^2}, 0, 0)$ . In addition the factor  $\sqrt{\dot{x}_\mu^2}$  in eq.(1) is non-trivial. Now the motion does not look homogeneous and  $w_\mp$  seems to explicitly depend on time, which again makes the study of the phenomenon difficult (impossible).

For these reasons we turn our attention to circular motion. We will consider homogeneous circular motion, i.e. eternal circular motion with no starting or stopping. However we will show that homogeneous circular motion is a good approximation for real circular motion with a starting and stopping time. In the next section we will discuss under what conditions one could observe the circular Unruh effect using charged particles with spin as the detectors.

### 3.3 Motion with constant circular acceleration

If the detector performs homogenous, circular motion [21] with radius  $R$  and with the angular velocity  $\omega_0$ , then  $x(t) = (\gamma t, R \cos[\gamma \omega_0 t], R \sin[\gamma \omega_0 t], 0)$ ,  $\gamma = 1/\sqrt{1 - R^2 \omega_0^2}$  and  $t$  is the detector's proper time.

Inserting this trajectory into eq.(28), we obtain:

$$w_\mp \propto \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \oint_{C_\mp} d\tau \frac{e^{\mp i \Delta\mathcal{E} \tau}}{[\gamma (\tau - i\epsilon)]^2 - 4 R^2 \sin^2 \left[ \frac{\gamma \omega_0}{2} \tau \right]}. \quad (39)$$

Again  $w_\mp$  does not depend on  $t$ , because the motion is homogeneous. Also the integration is over the proper time, but since circular motion has a simple relationship between proper time,  $\tau$ , and laboratory time ( $\tau_L = \gamma \tau$ ) one can easily change to the laboratory frame as in the case of the motion with constant velocity. This is an important difference between circular and linear acceleration which makes the analysis of the circular case more straightforward. Furthermore, in the case of circular motion one can easily transform the expression in eq.(39) from the laboratory reference frame to either the inertial *instantaneously*, co-moving reference

frame or the non-inertial, co-moving reference frame. Such transformations can not be so easily done in the case of linearly accelerating motion.

The integrand in eq.(39) has poles in the complex  $\tau$  plane. In particular it has poles similar in nature to those in the Wightman function for a heat bath or for linear acceleration, which lead to a Boltzmann type exponential contribution to  $w_{\mp}$ . However, there are also pre-exponential contributions to  $w_{\mp}$  for circular motion which spoil the exact thermal behavior.

Following [12] let us compare the Wightman functions for the cases of linear and circular acceleration:

$$\begin{aligned} G_L(\tau) &\propto \frac{a^2}{\sinh^2 \left[ \frac{a}{2} (\tau - i\epsilon) \right]} \approx \frac{1}{(\tau - i\epsilon)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{12} [a\tau]^2 + \frac{1}{360} [a\tau]^4 + \dots \right)^{-1}, \\ G_C(\tau) &\propto \frac{1}{[\gamma (\tau - i\epsilon)]^2 - 4R^2 \sin^2 \left[ \frac{\gamma\omega_0}{2} \tau \right]} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{(\tau - i\epsilon)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{12} [a\tau]^2 - \frac{1}{360v^2} [a\tau]^4 + \dots \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where for the case of circular motion the velocity is  $v = \omega_0 R \gamma$  and the acceleration is  $a = \gamma^2 \omega_0^2 R$  in the co-moving frame. Note that the difference between  $G_L(\tau)$  and  $G_C(\tau)$  appears only in the third term on the RHS of both equations.

The integral in eq.(39) can not be done exactly unlike the linear acceleration case (see [22] for a semi-analytical study of this integral in various limiting regimes). However, as we show in the next section the circular case simplifies for large  $\gamma$ . Assuming that the energy splitting is not too small (i.e.  $\Delta\mathcal{E} > a$ ) we can approximate the Wightman function by

$$G_C(\tau) \approx \frac{1}{(\tau - i\epsilon)^2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{12} [a\tau]^2 \right)^{-1}. \quad (41)$$

The integral in eq.(39) can now be computed with the result

$$\begin{aligned} w_- &\propto q^2 \left| \left\langle 0 \left| \mu \right. (0) \left| 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 a e^{-\sqrt{12} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{a}}, \\ w_+ &\propto q^2 \left| \left\langle 0 \left| \mu \right. (0) \left| 1 \right\rangle \right|^2 a \left( e^{-\sqrt{12} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{a}} + 4\sqrt{3} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{a} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

The exponential contribution comes from the non-trivial pole in (41) at  $\tau = \pm i 2\sqrt{3}/a$ . The second contribution to  $w_+$  comes from the trivial pole at  $\tau = 0$ .

For  $\Delta\mathcal{E} \gg a$ , the equilibrium population of the upper level relative to the lower level is

$$\mathbb{P}_0 = \frac{w_+ - w_-}{w_+ + w_-} \approx 1 - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{3}} \frac{a}{\Delta\mathcal{E}} e^{-2\sqrt{3} \frac{\Delta\mathcal{E}}{a}}. \quad (43)$$

This is exactly the kind of equilibrium “polarization” we will obtain in the next section when we study the Sokolov-Ternov effect for particles with large gyromagnetic number  $g$ . Note that this equilibrium “polarization” is not thermal due to the dependence of the pre-exponential factor on  $\frac{a}{\Delta\mathcal{E}}$ . Furthermore, even if we take into account corrections to eq.(43) we would not expect to get a thermal spectrum of the detected particles. Intuition from condensed matter informs us that the Planckian distribution is strongly related to the form of the two-point

correlation function in eq.(33). The two-point function for circular motion given in eq.(39) has a drastically different form than that in eq.(33).

The explanation why both  $w_+$  and  $w_-$  are not zero in this case is the same as the one given at the end of the previous subsection. Here we find:

$$w_{\mp} \propto q^2 \left| \langle 0 | \mu(0) | 1 \rangle \right|^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int \frac{d^3 p}{4\pi^2 \omega} \exp \left\{ -i \left[ (\pm \Delta \mathcal{E} + \gamma \omega) \tau - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{R}(\tau) \right] \right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}, \quad (44)$$

where  $\vec{R}(\tau) = (R \cos[\gamma \omega_0 \tau] - 1, R \sin[\gamma \omega_0 \tau], 0)$ . Again after taking the integral over  $\tau$  the resulting expression under the integral over  $d^3 p$  is not zero for any choice of sign in front of  $\Delta \mathcal{E}$ , which means that the detector can emit negative energy states, i.e. get excited to  $\mathcal{E}_u$ . Again quasi-classics gives a clearer picture of the phenomenon. According to [17] (see [19] for the quasi-classical study) the detector clicks due to falling particles to the center (orbiting detector) from the vacuum fluctuations. See as well [23] for a more detailed discussion of this issue.

## 4 Sokolov–Ternov effect at arbitrary gyromagnetic number and Unruh effect

In this section we will use an electrically charged particle with spin which is undergoing circular motion as our detector for the circular Unruh effect. We now give the conditions under which the particle's motion can be considered classical. We will mostly be discussing electrons, but we keep the gyromagnetic number  $g$  arbitrary. Unlike the previous cases, in this section we will only consider the laboratory reference frame and laboratory time.

There are two sources of quantum effects in synchrotron radiation: (i) the quantization of the electron's trajectory and (ii) quantum back-reaction under photon emission. The first one is suppressed if  $\omega_0/\mathcal{E} \ll 1$ , where  $\mathcal{E}$  is the electron's energy and  $\omega_0 = eH/\mathcal{E}$  is the angular velocity of the electron moving in a background magnetic field  $H$ , i.e.  $\omega_0$  is the energy splitting between the Landau levels.

The second source of quantization is defined by the ratio  $\omega_c/\mathcal{E}$ , where

$$\omega_c = \omega_0 \left( \frac{\mathcal{E}}{m} \right)^3 = \omega_0 \gamma^3, \quad (45)$$

is the characteristic frequency of the photons emitted in the synchrotron radiation [10], [11]. Here  $m$  is the mass of the electron. If the ratio in question satisfies

$$\frac{\omega_c}{\mathcal{E}} \ll 1 \quad (46)$$

then the electron is ultra-relativistic and its motion is essentially classical.

Another approximation which we adopt comes from the characteristic features of the radiation in the ultra-relativistic case. Consider a relativistic electron with  $\gamma = \frac{\mathcal{E}}{m} \gg 1$ . The angular distribution of the radiated power in this ultra-relativistic limit is proportional to large powers of

$$\frac{1}{(1 - \vec{n} \cdot \vec{v})} \quad (47)$$

where  $\vec{n} = \vec{p}/\omega$  and  $\vec{p}$  and  $\omega$  are the photon's momentum and energy [11], [24]. Because of the large negative powers of  $1 - \vec{n} \cdot \vec{v}$  the radiation is concentrated in a narrow cone around the direction of the velocity  $\vec{v}$ . The angle of the cone is approximately defined by ( $v \approx 1$ ):

$$1 - \vec{n} \cdot \vec{v} = 1 - v \cos \theta \approx 1 - v + \frac{\theta^2}{2} \approx \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma^2} + \theta^2 \right), \quad (48)$$

where  $\theta$  is the angle between the velocity  $\vec{v}$  and the radiation direction  $\vec{n}$ . Hence, the angle of the radiation cone is

$$\theta < \frac{1}{\gamma} = \frac{m}{\mathcal{E}}. \quad (49)$$

Thus, the radiation in a given direction is formed from the small part of the trajectory, over which the velocity vector  $\vec{v}$  is rotated by the angle  $m/\mathcal{E} \ll 1$ . The electron covers this part of the trajectory in a laboratory time  $\Delta t$  given by

$$\Delta t |\dot{\vec{v}}| \approx \Delta t \omega_0 \leq \frac{1}{\gamma} \ll 1. \quad (50)$$

It is this interval of time which gives the main contribution to the integrals we calculate below.

## 4.1 Synchrotron radiation due to the electric charge

There are two ways the electron radiates. The first one is the well known synchrotron radiation of a charged particle. The interaction Hamiltonian in this case is:

$$\hat{H}_{int} = e \vec{A} \cdot \hat{\vec{v}}, \quad (51)$$

where the velocity operator is  $\hat{\vec{v}} = (-i/m) \nabla$  and the vector potential  $\vec{A}$  is taken to be in the radiation gauge,  $\nabla \cdot \vec{A} = 0$ . The vector potential of a plane electromagnetic wave with the polarization  $\vec{\zeta}$  is

$$\vec{A}(\vec{r}, t) = \vec{\zeta} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{\omega}} e^{-i[\omega t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}]} + \text{c.c.}, \quad \text{where } \omega = |\vec{p}|. \quad (52)$$

The radiation probability of a photon with the momentum in the range  $[\vec{p}, \vec{p} + d\vec{p}]$  is equal to

$$dP = \left| i \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \langle \Psi_f(t) | \hat{H}_{int}(t) | \Psi_i(t) \rangle dt \right|^2 \frac{d^3 p}{(2\pi)^3}, \quad (53)$$

where  $\vec{p}$  is the photon momentum. The integral over the laboratory time  $t$  should be taken over the period of the circular motion [10] [11]. However, we have taken the integration region over the whole real line, because the integral is saturated in the saddle point approximation by the small region of  $t$  given in eq.(50).

As in the introduction, we change the integration variables to  $\tau = t - t'$  and  $\tau' = t + t'$  and drop the integral over  $\tau'$ . In this way we obtain an expression for  $dw$  – the radiation rate per

unit time and per infinitesimal momentum  $d\vec{p}$ . The infinitesimal radiation power is  $dI_o = \omega dw$ . Taking the interaction Hamiltonian which corresponds to photon emission gives

$$dI_o = \frac{e^2 d^3p}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \left\langle \Psi_i \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \left| \vec{\zeta} \cdot \hat{\vec{v}} \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) e^{-i[\omega(t+\frac{\tau}{2}) - \vec{p} \cdot \hat{\vec{r}}(t+\frac{\tau}{2})]} \right| \Psi_f \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \right\rangle \cdot \left\langle \Psi_f \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \left| \vec{\zeta}^* \cdot \hat{\vec{v}} \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) e^{i[\omega(t-\frac{\tau}{2}) - \vec{p} \cdot \hat{\vec{r}}(t-\frac{\tau}{2})]} \right| \Psi_i \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \right\rangle, \quad (54)$$

where the velocity  $\hat{\vec{v}}(t)$  and the coordinate  $\hat{\vec{r}}(t)$  are the Heisenberg operators. In the quasi-classical approximation adopted here these operators can be substituted by their classical values, i.e.

$$\left\langle \Psi_f(t) \left| \vec{\zeta}^* \cdot \hat{\vec{v}}(t) e^{i[\omega t - \vec{p} \cdot \hat{\vec{r}}(t)]} \right| \Psi_i(t) \right\rangle \rightarrow \vec{\zeta}^* \cdot \vec{v}(t) e^{i[\omega t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}(t)]}, \quad (55)$$

where  $\vec{v}(t) = \dot{\vec{r}}(t)$  and  $\vec{r}(t) = (r_1(t), r_2(t), r_3(t))$  are now classical velocities and coordinates along the trajectory in laboratory time  $t$ :

$$r_1(t) = x_0 + \frac{m}{eH} \sin \left( \frac{eH}{\mathcal{E}} t + \varphi \right), \quad r_2(t) = y_0 + \frac{m}{eH} \cos \left( \frac{eH}{\mathcal{E}} t + \varphi \right). \quad (56)$$

These equations for the trajectory are correct if the electron is ultra-relativistic ( $|\vec{v}| \approx 1$ ) and moving in the plane perpendicular to the magnetic field  $\vec{H}$ . The initial conditions are given by  $x_0, y_0, \varphi$ . Substituting eq.(56) into eq.(55) and then into eq.(54) and summing over the photon polarizations and integrating over  $d\tau$  in the saddle point approximation yields, in the large  $\omega$  limit [10]:

$$\frac{dI_o}{d\omega} \approx \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{e^3 \omega_c}{\gamma^2} \left( \frac{\omega}{\omega_c} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{2\omega}{3\omega_c} \right\}, \quad \omega_c = \omega_0 \gamma^3. \quad (57)$$

This equation shows that the main contribution to the radiation comes from the photons with frequency around  $\omega_c$ . This confirms the discussion around eq.(45). If in eq.(54) we had instead taken the integrals over both  $\vec{p}$  and  $\tau$  in the appropriate approximation we would have obtained eq.(8).

## 4.2 Synchrotron radiation due to spin flip

In addition to the radiation associated with its charge the electron can also radiate via a spin flip transition. The energy distribution of this radiation is similar to the one given in eq.(57) [9]. We are interested in the probability rate of the radiation, which can be obtained from the relativistic motion of a spin  $\vec{s}$  as given by [10]:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\vec{s}}{dt} &= i \left[ \hat{H}_{int}, \vec{s} \right], \\ \hat{H}_{int} &= -\frac{e}{m} \vec{s} \left[ \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \vec{H} - \frac{\alpha \gamma}{\gamma + 1} \vec{v} \left( \vec{v} \cdot \vec{H} \right) - \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \right) \vec{v} \times \vec{E} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

where  $\alpha = (g - 2)/2$  is the magnetic moment anomaly,  $\vec{v}$  is the particles velocity and  $\vec{E}$  is the electric field. Substituting the vector potential for the outgoing photon from eq.(52) into

eq.(58) and then substituting this Hamiltonian into eq.(53), yields the total probability rate (in the quasi-classical approximation of the electron's motion)

$$w_{\mp}(t) = \frac{e^2}{4\pi^2 m^2} \sum_{\text{phot. pol.}} \int \frac{d^3 p}{\omega} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \langle i | s_k^* \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) | f \rangle \langle f | s_j \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) | i \rangle \cdot \\ W_{km} \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \zeta_m^* W_{lj} \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \zeta_l \exp \left\{ -i \left( \omega \tau - \vec{p} \cdot \left[ \vec{r} \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) - \vec{r} \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \right] \right) \right\} \quad (59)$$

where we have taken the sum over the photon polarizations and the  $W_{il}$  are given by

$$W_{il}(\vec{p}, \omega, t) = \left[ \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma} \right) \epsilon_{ijl} p_j - \frac{\alpha \gamma}{\gamma + 1} v_i(t) \epsilon_{jml} v_j(t) p_m - \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \right) \epsilon_{ijl} v_j(t) \omega \right] \quad (60)$$

and  $\vec{v}(t) = \dot{\vec{r}}(t)$ . The origin of the subscripts  $\mp$  in the LHS of eq.(59) will be explained in a moment.

In eq.(59) the integral over  $\tau$  should be over the period of the circular motion. However, we can extrapolate the integration region to the whole real line, because the integral is saturated by the small region of values of  $\tau$  defined in eq.(50). It is this approximation which allows us to model the realistic motion of charged particles in storage rings by homogeneous circular motion.

To evaluate  $w_{\mp}(t)$  further we need to evaluate the expectation values of the spin operators. From eq.(58) with a constant magnetic field,  $H$ , the spin operators evolve in laboratory time according to

$$s_{\pm}(t) = s_1(t) \pm i s_2(t) = s_{\pm}(0) e^{\pm i \omega_s t}, \quad s_3(t) = s_3(0), \\ \omega_s = \left[ 1 + \gamma \left( \frac{g-2}{2} \right) \right] \omega_0, \quad (61)$$

where  $\omega_s$  is the precession frequency of the spin in the external, constant magnetic field, i.e. it is the energy difference  $\mathcal{E}_u - \mathcal{E}_d$  between the upper and lower spin energy levels. Because we are interested in spin flip transitions we take the initial value of the spin ( $|i\rangle$ ) either along or against the magnetic field and then flip it ( $\langle f | \neq \langle i |$ ). This yields,

$$\langle f | s_+(0) | i \rangle = \left\langle f \left| \frac{1}{4} (\sigma_1 + i \sigma_2) \right| i \right\rangle = -\frac{1}{4} (1 \mp 1), \\ \langle f | s_-(0) | i \rangle = \left\langle f \left| \frac{1}{4} (\sigma_1 - i \sigma_2) \right| i \right\rangle = \frac{1}{4} (1 \pm 1), \\ \langle f | s_z(0) | i \rangle = \left\langle f \left| \frac{1}{2} \sigma_3 \right| i \right\rangle = 0. \quad (62)$$

In the first two equations the upper sign corresponds to the spin flip which increases the spin energy, while lower sign decreases the spin energy. These signs correspond to the signs in eq.(59). In addition using

$$\sum_{\text{phot. pol.}} \zeta_m^* \zeta_l = \delta_{ml} - \frac{p_m p_l}{p^2}, \quad (63)$$

and

$$G(\vec{r}, t) = \frac{4\pi}{(t - i\epsilon)^2 - \vec{r}^2} = \int \frac{d^3\vec{p}}{\omega} \exp \left\{ -i (\omega t - \vec{p} \cdot \vec{r}) \right\} \Big|_{\omega=|\vec{p}|}, \quad (64)$$

the probability rates are

$$\begin{aligned} w_{\mp}(t) &= \frac{e^2}{4\pi^2 m^2} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \left\langle i \left| s_k^*(0) \right| f \right\rangle \left\langle f \left| s_j(0) \right| i \right\rangle \oint_{C_{\mp}} d\tau \\ &\times \left[ \hat{W}_{km} \left( t - \frac{\tau}{2} \right) \hat{W}_{mj} \left( t + \frac{\tau}{2} \right) + \left( \alpha + \frac{1}{\gamma + 1} \right)^2 \epsilon_{knm} v_n \epsilon_{jli} v_l \frac{\partial}{\partial r_m} \frac{\partial}{\partial r_i} \right] \\ &\times \frac{4\pi e^{\mp i \omega_s \tau}}{(\tau - i\epsilon)^2 - [\vec{r}' - \vec{r}]^2} \Big|_{r=r(t-\frac{\tau}{2}), r'=r(t+\frac{\tau}{2})}, \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

where  $\hat{W}$  is the differential operator obtained by substituting  $\vec{p} = i\partial/\partial\vec{r}$  and  $\omega = i\partial/\partial t$  into eq.(60). Taking a homogeneous circular trajectory for  $r(t)$  we find that, up to the pre-exponential differential operator, eq.(65) coincides with eq.(39).  $\mathcal{E}_u - \mathcal{E}_d$  is replaced by  $\omega_s$ , since now the energy difference comes from the electron's spin in a constant, background magnetic field. This pre-exponential is the source of the difference between the standard Sokolov–Ternov effect (where the detector is coupled to the electromagnetic field) and the circular Unruh effect (where the detector is coupled to a scalar field). Usually one takes the Unruh effect as being given only by the exponential contribution to  $w_{\mp}$  as in eq.(42).

To take the integral in eq.(65) we change the integration variable to  $z = \tau \omega_0 \gamma$ , take the contours,  $C_{\mp}$ , defined in the previous section, use the approximate expression for the Wightman function eq.(41) and use the standard integrals

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \oint_{C_{-}} \frac{e^{-iAz} dz}{(z - i\epsilon)^n \left(1 + \frac{z^2}{12}\right)^m} &= \frac{i^n e^{-A\sqrt{12}} \pi (\sqrt{12})^{1-n}}{(m-1)!} \\ &\times \left( \frac{n+1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{n+1}{2} + 1 \right) \dots \left( \frac{n+1}{2} + m - 2 \right), \quad m \geq 1, \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

and similarly for  $C_{+}$ . The non-trivial pole contribution in eq.(65) from the integral over  $\tau$  is the same as the saddle point contribution which plays its role if in eq.(59) one takes the integral over  $\tau$  first and then takes the integral  $d^3p$ . An important point to note is that after substituting the contribution of the non-trivial pole ( $z = \pm i2\sqrt{3}$ ) into the exponent of eq.(65) we obtain an expression proportional to  $e^{-(1/\gamma + \sqrt{12})\alpha}$ . If  $g \approx 2$  (the case of electrons) and  $\gamma \gg 1$  the exponential factor  $\approx 1$ . This is the reason why its contribution is usually overlooked in the standard Sokolov–Ternov calculation.

Combining eq.(65), eq.(41), eq.(66) and considering only  $\alpha > 0$  yields [9]

$$w_{\mp} \approx \frac{1}{2\tau_0} \left\{ F_1(\alpha) e^{-\sqrt{12}\alpha} + F_2(\alpha) \mp F_2(\alpha) \right\}, \quad (67)$$

where  $\tau_0$  is given in eq.(11) and

$$\begin{aligned} F_1(\alpha) &= \left( 1 + \frac{41}{45}\alpha - \frac{23}{18}\alpha^2 - \frac{8}{15}\alpha^3 + \frac{14}{15}\alpha^4 \right) - \frac{8}{5\sqrt{3}} \left( 1 + \frac{11}{12}\alpha - \frac{17}{12}\alpha^2 - \frac{13}{24}\alpha^3 + \alpha^4 \right), \\ F_2(\alpha) &= \frac{8}{5\sqrt{3}} \left( 1 + \frac{14}{3}\alpha + 8\alpha^2 + \frac{23}{3}\alpha^3 + \frac{10}{3}\alpha^4 + \frac{2}{3}\alpha^5 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

One can see the exponential factor in eq.(67), which appears for the same reasons as the one in eq.(42). This is the Unruh type contribution. Let us look at the phenomenon in greater detail. If  $g = 2$  (i.e.  $\alpha = 0$ ) we obtain the characteristic time equal to  $\tau_0$  and the equilibrium polarization is given by eq.(10) where:

$$w_{\mp} \approx \frac{5\sqrt{3}}{8} \frac{e^2 \gamma^5}{m^2 R^3} \left( 1 \mp \frac{8\sqrt{3}}{15} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}_0 = \frac{w_+ - w_-}{w_+ + w_-} = \frac{8}{5\sqrt{3}}. \quad (69)$$

If instead one considers the  $g \gg 1$  limit then one obtains the simple rate given in eq.(14), as discussed in the introduction. The first correction to eq.(14) in this limit is due to the  $\alpha^4/\alpha^5$  term in  $F_1(\alpha)/F_2(\alpha)$  as can be seen from the probability rates in eq.(67):

$$w_{\mp} \approx \frac{g^5}{2^6 \tau_0} \left\{ \left[ \frac{14}{15} - \frac{8}{5\sqrt{3}} \right] \frac{e^{-\sqrt{3}(g-2)}}{g} + \frac{16}{15\sqrt{3}} \mp \frac{16}{15\sqrt{3}} \right\} + O\left(\frac{1}{g^2}\right). \quad (70)$$

In this limit the equilibrium polarization is

$$\mathbb{P}_0 \approx \frac{1}{1 + \frac{F_1(\alpha)}{F_2(\alpha)} e^{-\sqrt{3}(g-2)}} \approx 1 - \left[ \frac{\text{const}}{g} + O\left(\frac{1}{g^2}\right) \right] e^{-\sqrt{3}g}. \quad (71)$$

Comparing this result with eq.(43) we find perfect agreement if we take into account that here  $\Delta\mathcal{E}/a \approx g/2$  and we are using the limit  $g, \gamma \gg 1$ .

## 5 Conclusions

The arguments presented above show that physically the Sokolov–Ternov and Unruh effects are essentially the same, i.e. if we study the Sokolov–Ternov effect for electrons from the point of view of the non-inertial, co-moving, reference frame then it appears to arise from an Unruh type radiation. In fact, in the non-inertial co-moving reference frame the electrons are at rest. In this case the spin flip transition with the decrease of the spin energy can happen at least due to the spontaneous radiation. But what is the reason for the spin flip transition with the increase of the spin energy if the electrons are at rest? In this note we show that the latter transition happens due to existence of the Unruh type radiation existing in the non-inertial co-moving reference frame.

Usually one considers the Unruh effect under the condition where the motion of the detector is decoupled from its internal degrees of freedom (as explained in the introduction). In this situation the Unruh effect manifests itself through the characteristic exponential factor in the probability excitation rate. However, in the experimentally realizable situation one has to consider charged particles with the spin as the detectors for Unruh type radiation. In this case usually there is no decoupling of the motion of the detector from its internal degrees of freedom. Only if  $g \rightarrow \infty$  do we obtain the decoupling and then the characteristic exponential factor dominates<sup>4</sup>. For general values of  $g$  the exponential factor is mixed with the pre-exponential contributions. In any case, we have shown that if one accepts the Sokolov-Ternov effect then

---

<sup>4</sup>Note that there is always the exponential contribution to the Sokolov–Ternov effect, i.e. even if  $g = 2$ . In the latter case it is proportional to  $e^{-1/\gamma}$  and basically equal to 1 in the extreme relativistic limit  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ .

this immediately implies the existence of the circular Unruh effect (and by extension the linear Unruh effect and also Hawking radiation from black holes) since both the Sokolov-Ternov and Unruh exponential factor appear due to the contribution of the non-trivial pole at  $z = -i 2\sqrt{3}$  in eq.(65) and are physically due to the fact that detectors (electrons) see exotic radiation in their non-inertial reference frame. It just happens that as we change  $g$  the way in which the detector couples to the background QFT changes as well.

However, the experimental observation of the characteristic exponential factor is difficult for electrons which have  $g \approx 2$  making this factor  $\approx 1$ . One can consider using a stable enough particle with  $g$  substantially different from 2. The proton with  $g \approx 5.6$  seems the best candidate. However, since the proton's mass is approximately 2000 times that of the electron the relaxation time  $\tau_0$ , eq.(11), will be much larger than the relaxation time for the electron. Changing only the mass term in eq.(11) gives a relaxation time on the order of  $10^6$  times longer than for the electron. Also it is much harder to "cook" protons so as to obtain a large enough  $\gamma$ -factor. Recent values of the  $\gamma$ -factor for protons produced at LHC are only  $7 \times 10^3$ . These values of  $\gamma$ ,  $m$  and  $R \sim 4$  km (as at the LHC) give enormous relaxation times making the the exponential, Unruh type contribution to the polarization impossible to detect using protons at present accelerators.

The main reason for interest in the Unruh effect is that it provides a simple test case for understanding how to properly quantize a field theory in a background different from Minkowski. This by extension would allow one to get a deeper understanding of closely related effects such as black hole radiation. However, in this paper we have considered the Unruh effect from the point of view of the spacetime with the Minkowski metric. But it is its consideration from the point of view of the metric of the non-inertial, co-moving reference systems (in which the detector is stationary) which leads one to addressing the problem of quantizing a field theory in a background different from Minkowski spacetime. To accomplish this one should change from Minkowski coordinates, which are seen by the laboratory observer, to Rindler coordinates, which are seen by the co-moving observer. The coordinate change is

$$x_0 = \frac{\rho}{a} \sinh(a t), \quad x = \frac{\rho}{a} \cosh(a t). \quad (72)$$

This transforms the Minkowski metric to the Rindler metric

$$ds^2 = -(a \rho)^2 dt^2 + d\rho^2 + dy^2 + dz^2. \quad (73)$$

To find the Wightman function for the scalar field in Rindler space we have to take the Wightman function in Minkowski space and make the coordinate change eq.(72). For the static trajectory in Rindler space the result is given in eq.(33). We can study the orbiting observer case in a similar way, and give an answer as to whether or not a detector in circular motion will click [25] (i.e. observe particles/radiation). From our analysis in sections 3 and 4 we can answer in the affirmative: the detector will indeed click! Note that the stationary, classical motion of the detector is equivalent to the metric being stationary in the detectors reference frame, i.e. it is in this case that we can neglect the gravitational back-reaction connected with the radiation. It is in this approximation that our conclusions are valid. In particular, only in the case when the back-reaction can be neglected does the detector moving with constant, linear acceleration see particles with a Planckian spectrum. If the motion is not homogeneous, the spectrum is drastically changed. As we have seen throughout this note, the spectrum is

different from a thermal spectrum even in the case of different types of homogeneous motion. These observations should be important toward resolving the black hole information paradox.

We can also use arguments in this paper to understand what is observed by a detector in the background of a Schwarzschild black hole with the mass  $M$ :

$$ds^2 = - \left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right) dt^2 + \frac{dr^2}{\left(1 - \frac{2M}{r}\right)} + r^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (74)$$

We want to study the behavior of a detector at rest with respect to the black hole in the vicinity of the horizon where the gravitational field is almost homogeneous (the gravitational field is almost homogeneous in the small vicinity of any surface with constant  $r$ ). Based on the equivalence principle we expect that the behavior of such a detector will be similar to the behavior of the linearly accelerating detector. To see this connection we make the following coordinate change in eq.(74):

$$\rho = \sqrt{1 - \frac{2M}{r}}. \quad (75)$$

This converts the Schwarzschild metric to

$$ds^2 = -\rho^2 dt^2 + \left(\frac{4M}{(1-\rho^2)^2}\right)^2 d\rho^2 + \left(\frac{2M}{1-\rho^2}\right)^2 d\Omega^2. \quad (76)$$

The horizon is at  $\rho = 0$ . Hence, in the vicinity of the horizon the metric is

$$ds^2 \approx -\rho^2 dt^2 + (4M)^2 d\rho^2 + \dots \quad (77)$$

One can show via a simple coordinate rescaling that this metric coincides with the Rindler metric of eq.(73) in the  $\rho - t$  space. Thus, a detector which is at rest in the vicinity of a Schwarzschild black hole will see thermal radiation for the same reason as a detector at rest in the Rindler metric.

All these arguments give a clearer picture of the conditions under which an observer will or will not detect particles/radiation and the character of the radiation. However, there are confusing [7] aspects of this topic which require a more detailed investigation of the quantization of fields in curvilinear coordinates. For example, one would like to know the details of the complete basis of harmonics in spaces with horizons and how these basis harmonics transform under various coordinate changes. The main question one would like to be able to answer in all these different cases is: “What is the criteria for the existence of radiation due to some particular gravitational background and/or detector motion?”

The presence of a horizon is not a necessary criteria; there is no horizon for the orbiting observer. In fact, there is a crucial difference between the Rindler and the orbiting observers. The Rindler observer has a horizon, since depending on the acceleration there is some point behind the observer beyond which even a massless particle can not reach the observer. On the other hand the orbiting observer can always be reached by particles from outside his light surface. Note, however, that an observer accelerating linearly for a finite time does not have a horizon.

Furthermore, it is *not* correct to say that any non-inertial moving observer sees radiation, while any inertial moving observer does not. Indeed, a free falling detector in the black hole

background does see radiation (e.g. an observer orbiting around a black hole). It is only the free falling observer in a homogeneous gravitational field (i.e. with zero Riemann tensor) which does not encounter radiation. At the same time an observer fixed above a gravitating body without a horizon (such as the Earth) does not see any radiation. Of course in the latter case the radiation would be so small that it could not be excluded experimentally. However, theoretically there is no means for such an object as the Earth to create particles and lose mass.

Thus, at this stage we propose the following criteria for the existence of radiation from a gravitational background and/or detector motion: a gravitational background and/or detector motion will have radiation associated with it if there exist negative energy states for the Hamiltonian of the QFT in the non-inertial reference frame [17]. Rephrasing, the criteria is based on the existence of a non-trivial saddle point contribution in the analogs of eq.(38) and eq.(44) for general motions and/or backgrounds.

### Acknowledgment

AET would like to thank S.Dubovski, P.Tinyakov, V.Rubakov, I.Polubin, N.Narozhny, A.Fedotov, V.Mur and especially A.Mironov and S.Mane for the valuable discussions. As well we would like to thank A.Morozov for collaboration at the initial stage of the work on this project. This work supported by the following grants: RFBR 04-02-16880 and the Grant from the President of Russian Federation for support of scientific schools, and a CSU Fresno International Activities Grant.

## References

- [1] W.G.Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, 870 (1976).
- [2] S.Schlicht, Class. Quant. Grav **21**, 4647 (2004).
- [3] S.W. Hawking, Comm. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975)
- [4] N.D.Birrel and P.C.W.Davis, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge: University Press, 1982.
- [5] N.B.Narozhny, A.M.Fedotov, B.M.Karnakov, V.D. Mur and V.A.Belinskii, Phys. Rev. D, **65**, 025004 (2002). See as well the discussion in S.A.Fulling and W.G.Unruh, Phys.Rev. D **70**, 048701 (2004) and the reply in N.B.Narozhny, A.M.Fedotov, B.M.Karnakov, V.D. Mur and V.A.Belinskii, Phys. Rev. D, **70**, 048702 (2004).
- [6] N.B.Narozhny, B.M.Karnakov, V.D. Mur and V.A.Belinskii, JETP Lett., vol. 65, ed. 12, p. 861 (1997).
- [7] V.A.Belinski, Phys.Lett. A **209**, 13 (1995);
- [8] A.A.Sokolov and I.M.Ternov, 1963, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **153**, 1052 [Sov.Phys.-Dokl. 8, 1203 (1964)]; V.N.Baier and V.M.Katkov, Phys.Lett. A **24**, 327 (1967); Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **52**, 1422 (1967) [Sov.Phys.-JETP **25**, 944 (1967)]; Ya.S.Derbenev and A.M.Kondratenko, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **64**, 1918 (1973) [Sov.Phys.-JETP **37**, 968 (1973)]
- [9] J.D.Jackson, Rev.Mod.Phys. **48**, 417 (1976).

- [10] L.Landau and L.Lifshits, *Relativistic Quantum Theory*, volume IV, Elsevier Science Ltd. (1977).
- [11] A.Borisov, A.Sokolov, I.Ternov and V.Zhukovski, *Quantum Electrodynamics*, Izdatelstvo Moskovskogo Universiteta, 1983 (in Russian).
- [12] J.S.Bell and J.M.Leinaas, Nucl.Phys. B **212**, 131 (1983); J.S.Bell and J.M.Leinaas, Nucl.Phys. B **284**, 488 (1987).
- [13] D.Barber and S.Mane, “On Bell and Leinaas and Derbenev and Kondratenko’s calculations of radiative electron polarization”, DESY–87–049, May 1987; D. Barber and S. Mane, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 456 (1988)
- [14] A.C.C. Guimaraes, G.E.A Matsas, and D.A.T. Vanzella, Phys. Rev. D **157**, 4461 (1999)
- [15] L.Landau and L.Lifshits, *Physical Kinetics*, volume X, Elsevier Science Ltd. (1977).
- [16] T.H.Boyer, Phys.Rev. D **21**, 2137 (1980).
- [17] J.I.Korsbakken and J.M.Leinaas, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 084016 (2004).
- [18] I.M.Frank, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Fiz. **6**, 3 (1942). V.P.Frolov and V.L.Ginzburg, Phys.Lett. A **116**, 423 (1986).
- [19] E.Akhmedov, V. Akhmedova, T.Pilling and D.Singleton, Int. J Mod. Phys. A **22**, 1705 (2007); E.Akhmedov, V.Akhmedova and D.Singleton, Phys.Lett. B **642**, 124 (2006)
- [20] L. Sriramkumar and T. Padmanabhan, Int. J. Mod. Phys. D **11**, 1 (2002), arXiv:gr-qc/9903054; K. Srinivasan, L. Sriramkumar and T. Padmanabhan, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 044009 (1998), arXiv:gr-qc/9710104; T.Padmanabhan, Astrophysics and Space Science **83** (1982) 247-268.
- [21] J. R. Letaw and J. D. Pfautsch, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1345 (1980); J. R. Letaw, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1709 (1981)
- [22] D Müller, “A semi-analytical method for the evaluation of the power spectrum of a rotating observer”, gr/qc/951203.
- [23] G.Volovik, Int.Ser.Monogr.Phys.117:1-526,2006.
- [24] L.Landau and L.Lifshits, *The Classical Theory of Fields*, volume II, Elsevier Science Ltd. (1977).
- [25] J. Louko and A. Satz, Class. Quantum Grav. **23**, 6321 (2006)  
**642**, 124 (2006)